

REMARKS

[0002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-28 are currently pending
- Claims 5 and 27 are canceled herein
- Claims 1, 6, 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 23, and 25 are amended herein

[0003] Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification at least in paragraphs 37 and 39 and in the drawings at least in Figure 3.

Cited Documents

[0004] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Alexander: Ronald Alexander, U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931
- Lemmons: Thomas R. Lemmons et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,266,814

Claims 1-28 Are Non-Obvious Over Alexander In View Of Lemmons

[0005] Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Alexander in view of Lemmons. In response, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

Independent Claim 1

[0006] In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the claimed:

presenting an electronic program guide (EPG) user interface (UI) illustrating a schedule of multimedia programming in a grid pattern, ***the grid pattern having a time dimension and a channel dimension, each multimedia program shown in the grid pattern being associated with a time and a channel;***

monitoring user interactions with the EPG UI, ***including presses of a scroll forward key indicative of a user's desire to see future scheduled programming in the EPG UI;***

in response to one or more triggering user interactions, presenting a quick EPG-navigation UI that is inlaid within the grid pattern of the schedule of multimedia programming, the EPG-navigation UI having one or more user-selectable options therein,

wherein the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI is presented so that the inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI is logically inlaid between time blocks of the schedule of multimedia programming in the grid pattern, ***the grid pattern being truncated with respect to the time dimension to accommodate the quick EPG-navigation UI***, and the schedule of multimedia programming and inlaid quick EPG-navigation UI both being presented simultaneously, and

wherein the triggering user interactions include a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future...

[0007] In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cited Figure 8 of Lemmons and several passages of Lemmons. Though the Examiner cites Figure 8 as showing a “quickmenu 116”, Applicant believes that the Examiner meant to point to Figure 3, as Figure 3 shows the quickmenu, and Figure 8 does not. Regardless, Applicant has considered both figures. Those figures and passages show and describe a quickmenu 116 that is invoked by pressing a “guide” key. Once invoked, the quickmenu 116 is shown as an overlay truncating the number of channels shown to the user (see Figure 3). That is, if the EPG formerly showed channels ABCD, the quickmenu overlay truncates, for example, all or a portion of channel D. The other dimension shown by the EPG – time – is not truncated in Lemmons.

[0008] In contrast, amended claim 1 recites that the quick EPG-navigation UI is invoked in response to “triggering user interactions” which “include a pre-determined number of presses of the scroll forward key or a number of presses of the scroll forward key which advances a presentation of a schedule of programming in the grid of the EPG UI a predefined amount of time into the future”. Thus, it is key presses with respect to navigating through the time shown on the EPG that invoke the quick EPG-navigation UI in claim 1, not a mere press of a guide key, as in Lemmons.

[0009] Further, amended claim 1 recites that “the grid pattern” of the EPG is “truncated with respect to the time dimension to accommodate the quick EPG-navigation UI”. Thus, Lemmons truncates the grid of the EPG with respect to the number of channels shown, while subject matter of claim 1 truncates the grid pattern with respect to time.

[0010] Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 13, 17, 21, and 25

[0011] These claims include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons, these claims are patentable over the cited references.

Dependent Claims 2-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, and 26-28

[0012] Claims 5 and 27 are canceled, thus obviating their rejections.

[0013] Claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25. As discussed above, claims 1, 13, 17, 21, and 25 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-12, 14-16, 18-20, 22-24, 26, and 28 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0014] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/ _____ Dated: 7/27/2009

Robert C. Peck(robpe@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)

Registration No. 56826

Reviewer/Supervisor: Robert L. Villhard (bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162)

Registration No. 53725